DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 774   IR 000 975

AUTHOR   Tate, Elizabeth L.
TITLE   ISBD(M): Background and Description.
INSTITUTION   Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE   9 Jul 74
NOTE   14p.; Paper presented at the American Library
                Association Annual Meeting (New York, N.Y., July 9,
                1974)

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS   *Bibliographies; *Cataloging; Documentation;
                *International Programs; Library Associations;
                *Standards
IDENTIFIERS   Anglo American Cataloging Rules; *International
                Standard Bibliographic Description; ISBD

ABSTRACT
        The International Standard Bibliographic Description
for Monographic Publications (ISBD(M)) is an international standard
developed by the International Federation of Library Associations
Working Group; it seeks to introduce uniformity in the bibliographic
descriptions prepared in national cataloging agencies throughout the
world for use in national bibliographies, or catalogs, or for other
purposes. Standardization is accomplished by presenting selected
bibliographic data in a prescribed order and identifying the data
through the arbitrary use of symbols which happen to be punctuation
marks. Although the standard bibliographic description is of vital
importance for the conversion of data to machine-readable form, it
also facilitates the comprehension of entries in unfamiliar languages
and permits descriptions of various origins to be integrated readily
into a single system. Virtually all of the provisions of the standard
have been incorporated into the revised rules for description in the
North American Text of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, so that
national cataloging agencies in the Western hemisphere may
participate in the international effort to achieve universal
bibliographic control. (Author/LS)

ISBD(M): BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

by

Elizabeth L. Tate

Paper presented at the program meeting, "International Standards

and the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules," sponsored by the

American Library Association Resources & Technical Services Division

Cataloging & Classification and Serials Sections on Tuesday, 9 July 1974

ISBD(M): BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

by Elizabeth L. Tate

This scene takes place in the catalog department of a large university library. The dramatis personae are Mrs. Hewitt, the reviser, and Mr. Archibald, the cataloger. The time, as you can clearly see from what I've just said, is post-Women's Lib, but pre-ISBD. Any resemblance to any persons or libraries, living or dead, is purely coincidental. Mrs. Hewitt is seated at her desk with an open book and several catalog cards before her. Beside her, seated on a stool, is Mr. Archibald. Mrs. Hewitt speaks first.

"I don't understand why you have used a comma here to separate the title from the subtitle."

"It seemed the right punctuation to use, Mrs. Hewitt."

"A semicolon would be a much better choice, Mr. Archibald."

"My English teacher instructed us to use a comma for similar cases, Mrs. Hewitt. And anyway there's a comma on the title-page."

"Mr. Archibald, it doesn't matter what your English teacher told you; in cataloging we follow the AA rules. Rule 133 says, 'The title proper ... is transcribed exactly as to order, wording, spelling, accentuation, and other diacritical marks ... but not necessarily as to punctuation and capitalization.' Now you look at all these examples I have here to see how it's done."

"Mrs. Hewitt, on this Library of Congress card there's a comma after the title."

"Humph, Library of Congress - at that place the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. Now, in this department we always use a semi-colon ..."

Twenty minutes later Mr. Archibald, unconvinced but obliging, returns to his desk to change the comma to a semicolon.

The next act occurs several months later - post ISBD. Mr. Archibald is again
discussing his work with Mrs. Hewitt, but the discussion concerns only such matters
as choice or form of entry, desirable added entries, etc., because each subtitle
has been separated from the title proper by a space-colon-space, as required by
the ISBD(M).

The scene shifts to the acquisition department of the same university library
five years later. Alice, a young paraprofessional, is looking disconsolately at
a long list of citations. As she heads toward the catalog with the list in her
hand, the following silent soliloquy ensues: "Miss Hemingway says I'm to find
out if these titles and editions are in the library, and if they aren't, then
I've gotta look in those foreign bibliographies to find out the prices. What
awful languages! Don't those people have any vowels? There's nothing here but
"w's" and "z's" and "y's" and "x's". I told 'em it was Spanish I took in high
school. Well, thank heaven, these have all been published recently and not
back in the dark ages like yesterday's list. At least the dashes and the slashes
will help me find my way around. And the current bibliographies will look the
same, too; I won't have to spend an hour figuring each one out before I can use
it. I sure hope Miss Hemingway gives Margaret the next list of old stuff to search."

In case this is a soliloquy you doubt ever got soliloquized, just write
it off as my ploy to direct your attention to the factor that has improved the
quality of life for Mr. Archibald and Alice — the International standard
bibliographic description for monographic publications. I should like this afternoon to tell
you how the standard came into existence, acquaint you with its principal features,
discuss the cataloging code revision that is based on the standard, and offer
a few suggestions for coping. You will prefer that I not discuss coping for
programmers, since I'm no expert in this field, so all computer people may

now leave in search of the MARC Development staff or go out for a short beer.

In October 1961 a unique event occurred – the International Conference on
Cataloguing Principles. During the McGill Institute in 1960 when the international
conference was in the planning stage, someone in my hearing asked the Executive
Secretary, A. H. Chaplin, if the planners hoped that the conference would result
in international acceptance of the new cataloging code. His reply, in the negative,
was most informative. As I recall, he pointed out that catalog code revision
was then underway or was being anticipated in many European countries. Simultaneously,
emerging countries, on the threshold of library development, were searching for
systems of bibliographic control, with each following its own preference in
selecting a model. If the representatives of countries with such disparate
cataloging experiences could merely reach agreement on certain fundamental
principles of entry, the planners would deem the conference a success.
It was a success and it paved the way for consideration of the next problems.

One of these problems acquired a sense of urgency because of subsequent
developments. 1966 marked the beginning of the National Program for Acquisitions
and Cataloging. The shared cataloging facet of This program, as you know, is based on the premise of the
exchangeability of data produced by well-established national cataloging agencies.
However, when the output of the various national bibliographies was channelled
into one stream, the multifarious differences in descriptive cataloging practices
were inescapable. Though the human mind can easily adjust to these variations
in a manual system, the computer cannot. The growth of shared cataloging had
been paralleled by the development of computer based systems in several countries.
If machine readable data were ever to be directly useable on an exchange basis,
it was imperative that uniform methods of bibliographic description be used.
The task of preparing a standard thus became the most important of the problems
identified by the Paris conference.

Accordingly, the IFLA Committee on Uniform Cataloguing Rules organized a conference of some forty people, who assembled in a new hotel on the outskirts of Copenhagen in August 1969. The cataloging experts at this international meeting envisioned a system for the international exchange of information in which a national cataloging agency in each country would be responsible for creating and distributing, in either eye-readable or machine-readable form, standard bibliographic descriptions for the publications originating in that country. They recognized that "The effectiveness of the system would depend upon the maximum standardization of the form and content of the bibliographic description," to use the words of their resolution.[1] To implement the resolution, they agreed upon several major elements to be covered by the standard and appointed a Working Group to draft the text. A. J. Wells and Michael Gorman, of the British National Bibliography, served as chairman and secretary, respectively, with France, Hungary, the Netherlands, West Germany, and the USA represented in the membership. The Working Group was as good as its name and in December 1971 published a preliminary edition. During the next two years, the ISBD(M) was translated into Dutch, French, Hungarian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish, and was adopted for use in eight national bibliographies.

As is well known to those who have supervised staff or taught school, any instruction more complex than "sit down" can be misunderstood, and even "sit down" in translation is susceptible to misinterpretation. It is not surprising then

---

[1] International Federation of Library Associations. ISBD(M) - International standard bibliographic description for monographic publications. — 1st standard ed. — London : IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1974. — p. vii.

that the application of some of the provisions of the standard produced different results in different countries. To take corrective action a two-day meeting was held last August prior to the IFLA conference at Grenoble. There were thirty-five participants representing organizations using or about to use the ISBD(M) or organizations interested in the standard like the International Standards Organization Technical Committee 46 and UNISIST. The changes proposed at the meeting were primarily for the purpose of amplifying or clarifying the text, for the participants were in agreement that the basic structure of the standard is satisfactory. The Working Group again went to work to produce the first standard edition of the International standard bibliographic description for monographic publications, issued in March 1974. The IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, the publishers, thoughtfully provided a recommended catalogue entry on the verso of the title-page. I have copied it for you on the first page of the handout you found on your chair, along with the recommended catalogue entry for the # 5.00 - Canadian = # 5.25 USA
ISBD(S) and information about the availability of both. The International standard bibliographic description for serials also was published in March 1974; other companion pieces, like a standard for audiovisual materials, or maps may well be appearing in the future.

As you might surmise, the ISBD(M) is not exactly bedside reading because the plot's a bit thin. I promise, therefore, not to read extensively from the text. However, I would like to summarize and quote enough to give you the flavor of it. The standard has been designed for monographs in printed format, and primarily for current publications. It includes no provisions for the special problems of older books. The purpose of the ISBD(M), according to the Introductory Notes, is "to aid the international communication of bibliographic information,

It does this by (i) making records from different sources interchangeable,
(ii) assisting in the interpretation of records across language barriers, and
(iii) assisting in the conversion of bibliographic records to machine readable
form."[2] To accomplish these purposes the standard employs four devices. First,
it specifies the kind of information to be included in the bibliographic descrip-
tion. Second, it indicates the order in which these data are to be recorded.
Third, it prescribes the symbols by which the data are to be identified, these
symbols being punctuation marks combined with spaces. Fourth, it spells out the
preferred sources of information for each category of information. The glossary
at the beginning of the standard contains two new terms with which catalogers
will need to become familiar. The first is "area." An area is a major section
of the bibliographic description. The second new word is "element". An element
is "a word or phrase, or a group of characters, representing a distinct item of
bibliographic information and forming part of an area of the bibliographic
description."[3] Thus the phrase "prepared by the Bureau of National Affairs"
is an element of the title and statement of authorship area.

Each bibliographic description consists of seven areas, presented in this
order: title and statement of authorship area; edition area; imprint area;
collation area; series area; notes area; and International Standard Book Number,
binding, and price area. For each of these areas the standard designates prime
sources of information. For example, the prime sources of information for the
edition area are the title-page, other preliminaries, and the colophon. The term
"other preliminaries" has been introduced into the standard to describe concisely

---

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

the pages preceding the title-page, the verso of the title-page, the front cover, and the spine. Data from any of the prime sources may be included in the description without brackets. For each of the seven areas, the standard enumerates the content of that area, indicates the prescribed punctuation, and outlines the detailed specifications.

Let us sample some of the provisions for the title and statement of authorship area. The standard begins, "The first element of the title and statement of authorship area is the title proper. The title proper is transcribed from the title-page. It is transcribed exactly as to wording but not as to capitalization and punctuation ... The title proper is the first element of the description even when it is preceded on the title-page by the statement of authorship, other titles, series titles or other matter. Where a statement of authorship, name of publisher, or other information is linguistically an integral part of the title proper, it is transcribed as such."[4] If you are experiencing that "déjà vu" feeling, it is not surprising for most of the provisions of the standard express the substance of the Anglo-American cataloging rules.

To conclude my comments on the standard itself, I should like to quote again from the Introductory Notes. "The ISBD(M) is intended to provide all the descriptive information required in a range of bibliographic activities. It therefore includes elements which may be essential to one or another of these activities, but not to all. It is recommended that in each country it should be the responsibility of the national bibliographic agency to make a complete description of each publication, containing all elements set out in the ISBD(M), except so far as it may omit elements stated to be optional."[5] Because the

[4]Ibid., p. 7-8.

[5]Ibid., p. 1.

intent is to provide all the data needed for a variety of purposes, the standard

has been designed to produce a bibliographic description that is self-sufficient

without the heading. However, the description will not customarily be used by

itself, but will appear in bibliographies or catalogs as part of an entry with

a main heading, tracing, or whatever else is appropriate to that tool. To illustrate

the self-sufficiency of an ISBD(M) bibliographic description and to suggest its

potential for interpreting records across language barriers, I have included in

your handout five entries without headings in what for me at least are non-

communicating languages - with the exception of the German which was added as a

touchstone.

In the United States the ISBD(M) could not be put into effect as

an isolated set of instructions. Our rules for description are once again part

of a complete code, and for this reason the first step toward implementation

had to be the revision of the chapter six of the Anglo-American cataloging rules. When the authors

of the code began to plan for the revision, they had high hopes that a single

British and North American Text might result. Unfortunately, the differences

in style and content between the two versions of chapter six could have been

eliminated only with the expenditure of far more editorial time than was avail-

able. The idea was abandoned and Michael Gorman of the British Library was

assigned the task of revising the British Text while Paul Winkler of L.C.

prepared the draft for the North American Text. The draft was reviewed, emended,

and approved by the ALA and CLA cataloging committees and it has just been

published as a separate by the ALA.

If you make a detailed comparison of these revised rules with the ISBD(M),

you will discover that almost all of the specifications and a great many of the

options have been adopted. However, you might be interested in hearing about

the few provisions of the standard that were rejected or modified. The ISBD(M)

regards an alternative title as part of the title proper; in the AACR the alternative

title is included in the category of "other title", primarily because of the effect

on added entries when it is defined as title proper. For multi-lingual title-pages

the ISBD(M) recommends repetition in various languages of bibliographic data like

author statements; the revised AACR strives for a more concise entry by curtailing

the amount of repetition. The ISBD(M) treats numbered theses as series; seeing

many disadvantages and few advantages to this practice, the authors of the AACR

decided to omit this proviso from the revision. The ISBD(M) devotes a separate

section to a two-level description of multi-volume publications, designed principally

for listings in national bibliographies; since other rules in chapter six of the AACR

provide adequately for these alternatives for cataloging purposes, the section was

entirely omitted. The one other modification, which has already been pointed out

in the literature, concerns the prime source of information for the International

Standard Book Number.[6] The ISBD(M) says "anywhere"; the AACR says "anywhere in

the publication or in data supplied by the publisher and accompanying the book."

The reason for that change is purely practical. As you know, many catalogers are

very thorough and dearly love the research required for cataloging. There was

always the danger with an instruction like "anywhere" that some might never

have come home again.

The process of revising the rules for description brought to light a few

bibliographical problems covered by the AACR but not encompassed in the ISBD(M).

Since most were minor, like the problem of chronograms, the present rule was

simply transferred to the revision. However, one proved to be quite a sticky

problem, related to the ISBD(S) as well as to the ISBD(M). A solution was devised

---

[6]G. Swanson, "ISBD, standard or secret?" Library journal, v. 98, nO. 2
(January 15, 1973), p. 128.

that seemed consonant with the spirit of the Standards, but the result will
have to be regarded as provisional, pending further consideration of the
question by the IFLA Working Group. The difficulty concerns series notes, and
in particular those series notes to which a statement of authorship must be added
to a generic title in order to identify the series properly. The solution is
not a radical departure from past practice but the explanation is highly technical
and would bore most everyone here, so I shall oblige you to find the answer for
yourself in rule 142E.

Revising the rules to accommodate the ISBD(M) offered an excellent opportunity
to accomplish some other objectives. In 1967 the Rules for descriptive cataloging
in the Library of Congress with little modification became chapter six of the
Anglo-American code. To reflect the wider applicability of the code it seemed
desirable to eliminate statements of L. C. policy from the text. The few such
statements that remain have been relegated to footnotes in this version. At
the same time, the Principal Descriptive Cataloger incorporated into the text
all of the changes previously made in the rules for description and announced
in Cataloging service, and he made certain editorial changes to clarify
ambiguities and solve problems that had surfaced during the past six years.
When you have your own copy in hand, you will notice that the revision supersedes
not only chapter six but chapter nine as well. This brief chapter provided
rules for the description of photographic reproductions, all of which have
been modified as required by the ISBD(M) and subsumed into chapter six.

To review briefly the ground we have just covered, the ISBD(M), an
international standard developed by the IFLA Working Group, seeks to introduce
uniformity into the bibliographic descriptions prepared in national cataloging
agencies throughout the world for use in national bibliographies, or catalogs,

or for other purposes. The standard relates to description only and does

not deal with questions of choice or form of entry. Standardization is

accomplished by presenting selected bibliographic data in a prescribed order

and identifying the data through the arbitrary use of symbols which happen

to be punctuation marks. Although the standard bibliographic description is

of vital importance for the conversion of data to machine-readable form, it

also facilitates the comprehension of entries in unfamiliar languages and

permits descriptions of various origins to be integrated readily into a single

system. The ISBD(M), which has already been adopted in at least eight other

countries, is now being implemented here. Virtually all of the provisions

of the standard have been incorporated into the revised rules for description

in the North American Text of the AACR, so that the national cataloging agencies

on this side of the Atlantic may participate in the effort to achieve universal

bibliographic control.

That's all very laudable, some of you are probably saying, but what does

this mean for me? Isn't everyone going to require re-education? If you are

a descriptive cataloger, the answer is "yes" - to some extent. You will have

to examine the revised rules thoroughly and consult them frequently as you

begin to prepare the new style entries. Just when you think you've got the

hang of it, you will need to watch carefully so that you do not subconsciously

revert to a comma where a space-slash-space ought to be. Descriptive catalogers

certainly will need some reorientation, but once the new punctuation becomes

a habit, the changes will not seem drastic. At L.C. the descriptive catalogers

have just completed brief introductory training in anticipation of the adoption

of the rules about the first of ~~August~~ Sept. In the handout you will find four of

the examples developed by the Cataloging Instruction Office, showing both old

and new entries, along with the corresponding title-pages. From the tapes

that we made during these training sessions, I have compiled a guide for

the descriptive catalogers in the L.C. overseas offices. The guide, which

must be used with the revised text in hand, calls attention, rule by rule, to

most of the changes and reports the Principal Descriptive Cataloger's answers

to some of the questions the catalogers asked. I have brought some extra copies

of this guide for descriptive catalogers in the audience who might find it

helpful.

If you are not a descriptive cataloger but some other kind of librarian,

the revised rules will have less impact. You will hear your colleagues in the

catalog department talk about "areas," "elements" and "other title information."

You will need to get used to the new punctuation pattern. In imprints you will

see "s.l." and "s.n." instead of "n.p." Reference librarians and bibliographers

will need to be aware that date of publication is now defined as the year of

publication of the first impression of an edition and many imprints will

include a printing date also. In some series notes you will find an International

Standard Serial Number. Some data like price and original imprint for reprint

editions will appear in different places on the card. But the catalog entry

will continue to provide you with the same information as before and little

conscious effort on your part will be required to adjust.

         at all

If you are not a librarian but a catalog user, you may not even realize

the millenium has arrived. Few of the elements of the international standard

bibliographic descriptions are innovations. Consequently, many of the changes

I have mentioned today are not new but are already in the system. The 1941 rules,

for example, required the use of ellipses for omissions and took for granted

the transcription of an author statement for each entry. Since European

national bibliographies have supplied descriptive data for most of the entries

Distributed in the shared cataloging program, abbreviations like "il." or "ill."
for illustrations can already be found in card catalogs in this country, along
with quite a wide variety of collations. Although the arbitrary use of punctua-
tion marks may at first seem strange to the reader, today's world is full of
symbols that communicate across national boundaries. Signs beside the highways
tell the foreign motorist in pictures that he can expect a steep hill, a sharp
curve, or a school crossing. Numbers intermixed with plus, minus, multiplication,
division or equals signs, communicate ideas to mathematicians who otherwise could
converse only in pidgin English. Rock and roll artists are provoked into sound
by a succession of ciphers with flags spaced out along a bunch of lines.
Catalog use studies indicate that the only descriptive data in the entry of
interest to most users are the author, the title, and the call number or location.
Those few readers who pore over L.C. cards have already been exposed to hieroglyphics
like asterisks and have survived. I shall be very much surprised if the intro-
duction of the ISBD(M) proves to be a traumatic experience for the catalog user.

Some time ago when I was surveying the literature for another paper, I had
occasion to read all of the reviews of the Anglo-American cataloging rules that
I could locate. Throughout these reviews three criticisms were levelled at the
code. It was faulted first because of the failure to produce a truly inter-
national code, secondly, because of the failure to revise the rules for
description, and thirdly, because of the failure to anticipate the new technologies.
Surely,
this revision of the rules of description to conform to the International
standard bibliographic description for monographic publications should serve
at least in part to answer those criticisms.